relevant times hereto. In committing the acts and omissions alleged hereto, Defendant Smith was acting under color of state law and within the course and scope of his employment as an officer in the Seattle Police Department. Defendant Smith is sued in his official and individual capacities.

- 1.3 Defendant John T. Brooks is a sergeant with the Seattle Police Department at all relevant times hereto, and is believed to have approved the arrest of the plaintiff. In committing the acts and omissions alleged hereto, Defendant Brooks was acting under color of state law and within the course and scope of his employment as an officer in the Seattle Police Department. Defendant Brooks is sued in his official and individual capacities.
- 1.4 Defendant John Diaz was Chief of Police for the Seattle Police Department at all relevant times hereto. In committing the acts and omissions alleged hereto, Defendant Diaz was acting under color of state law and within the course and scope of his employment with the Seattle Police Department. Defendant Diaz is sued in his official and individual capacities.
- 1.5 Defendant John or Jane Does I-IV include the other four Seattle Police Officers who assisted defendant Stephen Smith in the arrest and use of excessive force against plaintiff Garland or who failed to investigate the plaintiffs' arrest. John or Jane Does I-IV were acting under color of state law and within the course and scope of their employment as officers in the Seattle Police Department.
- 1.6 The City of Seattle is a municipal corporation in the State of Washington. Under its authority from the laws of the State of Washington, the City of Seattle operates the Seattle Police Department.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 2

OSBORN MACHLER

24 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 3

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2.1 This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violations of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.
- 2.2 The claims alleged herein arose in the City of Seattle, County of King,Washington. Therefore, venue in the Western District of Washington is proper pursuant to 28U.S.C. §1391(b)(2).

IV. FACTS

- 3.2 On May 1, 2013, protesters had gathered in downtown Seattle for their annual "May Day" protests. The newspaper, Real Change, had assigned one of its photographers, Joshua Garland, to photograph the events that day.
- 3.3 Earlier that day, while photographing various events for Real Change, Mr. Garland was exposed to pepper spray being used on others by the Seattle Police Department. Thereafter, Mr. Garland covered his nose and mouth with a scarf in an effort to protect himself from any further exposure to other pepper sprays.
- 3.4 Near the intersection of 1st Avenue and Pike St. in downtown, protesters had gathered and began chanting "Let him go! Let him go!" in reference to the Seattle Police Department arresting a protester at that time. Mr. Garland was trying to take photos of the situation and was standing near the line of police officers.
- 3.5 Without warning or provocation, Officer Smith shoved Mr. Garland backwards.

 Mr. Garland stumbled back a couple steps, and as he attempted to regain his balance, he was

OSBORN MACHLER

1	ya
2	w
3	ha
4	gı
5	ar
6	
7	to
8	co
9	in
10	G
11	Se
12	
13	of
14	be
15	Sı
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

22

23

24

yanked out of the crowd by Officer Smith. Officer Smith then threw Mr. Garland to the ground, wherein the other named defendant police officers helped to pin down Mr. Garland, while he was handcuffed and arrested. Officer Smith claimed in a sworn statement that Mr. Garland had grabbed his arm and twisted it, causing pain. Officer Smith's conduct was unlawful, malicious, and had no purpose, other than to punish the plaintiff and inflict pain.

- 3.6 Mr. Garland was charged with third degree assault, and his case was proceeding to trial. Those charges, however, were later dropped, because video evidence directly contradicted Officer Smith's version of the events. Along with the humiliation of being arrested in front of a crowd of people and almost losing his job due to the charges against him, Mr. Garland also suffered injuries. In addition to the various bumps and bruises, the actions by the Seattle Police Department caused a tear in the meniscus in his right knee.
- 3.7 No investigation was conducted into the arrest of the plaintiff or into the conduct of Officer Smith, whose sworn statement was directly contradicted by video evidence. To the best of plaintiff's knowledge, no discipline or retraining was performed with respect to Officer Smith's false statements and the unlawful arrest of the plaintiff.

V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the US Constitution:
Unlawful Search, Seizure, and Arrest by Use of Excessive
and Unlawful Force on May 1, 2013
Against Defendants SMITH and BROOKS in their individual and official capacities.

4.1 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1.1 through 3.6 of this complaint as though fully set forth therein.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 4

OSBORN MACHLER

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

4.2 On May 1, 2013, as described above at paragraphs 1.1 through 3.6, defendant Smith deprived plaintiff Garland of his clearly established right to be free from unjustified and excessive force utilized by police officers, as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Specifically, Officer Smith violated plaintiff Garland's constitutionally protected rights by arresting him without probable cause and using excessive force in making the unlawful arrest. Officer Smith made false statements in order to justify the unlawful arrest of the plaintiff and the use of force against him. Sergeant Brooks approved and ratified the unlawful arrest of the plaintiff and the use of force against him without investigation or verification of the false statements made by Officer Smith.

- 4.3 Defendants deprived plaintiff of his clearly established right to be free from unjustified and excessive force utilized by police officers, as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Plaintiff was damaged by reason thereof in at least the following respects:
 - a. Physical pain and suffering;
 - b. Permanent injury to Plaintiff's person;
 - c. Emotional pain and suffering.
- 4.4 Defendant Smith deprived plaintiff of his clearly established right, under the Fourth Amendment, to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. Defendant Smith lacked the required probable cause for an arrest of Plaintiff Garland.
- 4.5 Plaintiff Garland was subjected to the deprivation of rights by defendant Smith, acting or pretending to act under color of state law and of statutes, or ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of the law of the United States and State of Washington which rights

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 5

OSBORN MACHLER

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

include, but are not limited to, privileges and immunities secured to plaintiff Garland by the Constitution and laws of the United States. By reason of the acts specified herein Defendant Smith violated the constitutional rights of plaintiff Garland, including those provided in the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

4.6 As a direct and proximate result of this conduct, plaintiff Garland has suffered and will continue to suffer from physical and psychological harm, mental distress, humiliation, embarrassment, and fear and has suffered personal injury and emotional distress and incurred general damages for the deprivation of his constitutional rights, including but not limited to medical expenses.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution: Failure to Adequately Supervise and Train Seattle Police Department Officers Against Defendants CITY OF SEATTLE and SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

- 5.1 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1.1 through 4.6 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein. The allegations contained in paragraphs 5.2 through 5.3 below will have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.
- 5.2 Defendants City of Seattle and the Seattle Police Department, under color of law, intentionally, negligently, and with complete and deliberate indifference to plaintiff's rights, proximately caused plaintiff to be deprived of his constitutional rights including but not limited to the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, by:
 - a. Failure to adequately screen candidates for employment as police officers with regard to past allegations of misconduct while employed by other law

23

24

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 6

OSBORN MACHLER

enforcement agencies;

- b. Failure properly to supervise the training and conduct of Defendant Smith despite constructive or actual knowledge of unlawful actions by Defendant Smith;
- c. Failure to appoint, promote, train, supervise and discipline Police Officers, including Defendant Smith, who enforce the laws in effect in the City of Seattle and who would protect the constitutional rights of the people of the City of Seattle;
- d. Failure to properly and adequately train the officers in the Seattle Police
 Department, including Defendant Smith, in the use of force against citizens
 during the course of investigation and arrest;
- e. Failure to enforce the provisions of the Constitution of the United States concerning the use of force against citizens and provision of medical care to citizens injured during arrest;
- f. Maintaining a policy and custom of using excessive force against citizens and failing to provide medical care to citizens injured during arrest;
- Failing to address this failure despite being informed of such policy and custom;
 and
- h. Failing to issue any policy whatsoever, or issuing vague, confusing, and contradictory policies, concerning the use of force against citizens and provision of medical care to citizens injured during arrest, inconsistent with the requirements of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 7

OSBORN MACHLER

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	١

5.3 As a proximate result of the conduct of these Defendants, Plaintiff Garland has suffered and will continue to suffer from physical injury, psychological harm, mental distress, humiliation, embarrassment and fear and has suffered personal injury and emotional distress and incurred general damages for the deprivation of his constitutional rights including those damages pled above.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution: Ratification Against Former Chief John Diaz.

- 5.1 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1.1 through 4.6 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein. The allegations contained in paragraphs 5.2 through 5.3 below will have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.
- 5.2 Defendant, former Chief John Diaz, under color of law, intentionally, negligently, and with complete and deliberate indifference to plaintiff's rights, proximately caused plaintiff to be deprived of his constitutional rights including but not limited to the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, by:
 - a. Ratifying the unlawful arrest of the plaintiff and use of force against him;
 - b. Failing to investigate, discipline, or retrain Officer Smith, after his false statements caused the unlawful arrest of the plaintiff;

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants as follows:

- 1. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof;
- 2. For punitive damages against individual defendants only, in amounts

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 8

OSBORN MACHLER

Case 2:13-cv-02196-RSL Document 1 Filed 12/09/13 Page 9 of 9

1	according to proof;			
2	3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 an			
3	as otherwise authorized by statute or law;			
4	4. For costs of suit;	4. For costs of suit;		
5		Declaratory and injunctive relief; and		
6	6. For such other and further re	For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.		
7		2013		
8		ADALA CAN ED		
9	9 OSBC	ORN MACHLER		
10	0			
11		n J. Osborn, WSBA #14484 Machler, WSBA #23256		
12		neys for Plaintiffs		
13	3			
14	4			
15	5			
16	6			
17	7			
18				
19				
20				
21	$1 \mid \mid$			
22	2			
23	3			
24	4 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 9	OSBORN MACHLER 2125 Fifth Avenue Seattle, WA 98121 (206) 441-4110 (Tel)		

(206) 441-4220 (Fax)